Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01681 041929 Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 EURE-00 INRE-00 SS-15 NSC-10 CIAE-00

PM-09 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01

GAC-01 USIA-12 TRSE-00 MBFR-03 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 IO-12

AECE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 H-02 RSR-01 /144 W

P R 041900 Z APR 73 FM USMISSION NATO TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9625 SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2843 AMEMBASSY HELSINKI USICINCEUR USNMR SHAPE

CONFIDENTIAL USNATO 1681

E. O. 11652: GDS, 12-31-79 TAGS: PFOR, PARM

SUBJECT: CSCE: CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

REF: A) STATE 60887 (NOTAL); B) USNATO 1415

SUMMARY. ONLY MAJOR QUESTION WHICH WAS RAISED DURING POLADS APRIL 3 REVIEW OF IS PAPER ON CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES WAS FRG EFFORT TO ADD MATERIAL CLARIFYING IN DETAIL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CBM'S IN CSCE CONTEXT AND MBFR CONSTRAINTS. WE BELIEVE THAT FRG PROPOSAL SHOULD BE RESISTED. OTHER CHANGES PROPOSED DO NOT RAISE POINTS OF SUBSTANCE. OTHERWISE, IS PAPER IS GENERALLY ACCEPTED (WITH FRENCH RESERVE, HOWEVER). ACTION REQUESTED: UNLESS OTHERWISE INSTRUCTED, WE WILL RESIST GERMAN CHANGES AND ACCEPT OTHERS. END SUMMARY.

1. PER REFTEL, US REP ADVISED THAT WE COULD ACCEPT IS DRAFT WITHOUT CHANGE. FRG REP SUGGESTED THAT FIFTH OF CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01681 041929 Z

GENERAL CRITERIA LISTED IN PARA 4 SHOULD BE EXPANDED TO MAKE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CBM' S AND MBFR CONSTRAINTS AS CLEAR AS

POSSIBLE. PAPER SUBSEQUENTLY CIRCULATED BY FRG DELEGATION SUGGEST POINTING OUT THAT CBM'S AND CONSTRAINTS DIFFER IN TERMS OF: 1) " VOLUNTARY NATURE OF CBM'S" AS OPPOSED TO "OBLIGATORY NATURE" OF CONSTRAINTS; 2) FACT THAT ONLY CONSTRAINTS SHOULD BE VERIFIED; 3) " POLITICAL OBJECTIVES," (CBM' S SEEK INCREASE IN CONFIDENCE WHILE CONSTRAINTS DESIGNED SUPPORT MBFR AGREEMENT); AND 4) " NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE," WHICH BASED ON ANNUAL LISTS IN CASE OF CBM'S BUT WOULD BE ON CASE- TO- CASE BASIS FOR CONSTRAINTS. US REP OBSERVED THAT IS DRAFT MADE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CBM'S AND CONSTRAINTS SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR AND THAT ADDITIONAL EXPLANATIONS PROPOSED BY FRG DID NOT APPEAR TO BE NEEDED. FRG REP SUGGESTED THAT HIS PROPOSALS COULD BE INCLUDED IN FOOTNOTE TO FIFTH TICK IN PARA 4. (COMMENT: WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT ADDITON OF LANGUAGE PROPOSED BY FRG WOULD BE USEFUL, AND IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT FRG PROPOSAL COULD OBTAIN CONSENSUS IN ANY EVENT. SEVERAL OF DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN CBM'S AND CONSTRAINTS SUGGESTED BY FRG ARE BY NO MEANS GENERALLY ACCEPTED AND WOULD PROBABLY LEAD TO LENGTHY, AND UNNECESSARY, DISCUSSION IN COMM-ITTEE. WE UNDERSTAND THAT IN REVISED VERSION OF IS DRAFT. FRG POINTS WILL BE IN BRACKETED FOOTNOTE WITH LEAD- IN " IT WAS ALSO POINTED OUT THAT CBM'S IN CSCE CONTEXT AND MBFR CON-STRAINTS DIFFER IN IMPORTANT RESPECTS, SUCH AS:" END COMMENT.)

2. OTHER CHANGES PROPOSED IN PAPER WERE AS FOLLOWS:

PARA 6, FIRST SENTENCE - UK REP PROPOSED THAT WORDS " A RECENT" REPLACE WORDS " THE PREVIOUS".

PARA 6, THIRD SENTENCE - AT UK SUGGESTION FINAL CLAUSE OF SENTENCE NOW READS "THEY NEED NOT BE TOO COMPREHENSIVE AND MIGHT CONTAIN THE SOR OF DETAIL REFERRED TO IN PARA 9 BELOW."

PARA 10, SECOND SENTENCE - UK REP ASKED THAT WORDS " SUCH AS THOSE FOR INSTANCE RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MBFR AGREEMENTS" BE DROPPED.

3. AT CLOSE OF MEETING, UK REP SAID HE PLANNED CIRCULATE CONFIDENTIAL.

PAGE 03 NATO 01681 041929 Z

ILLUSTRATIVE LIST OF MANEUVERS, WHICH WILL BE TRANSMITTED WHEN RECEIVED. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X Capture Date: 02 APR 1999 Channel Indicators: n/a

Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Concepts: n/a Control Number: n/a Copy: SINGLE Draft Date: 04 APR 1973 Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960 Decaption Note: Disposition Action: RELEASED

Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO01681

Document Number: 1973NATO01681 Document Source: ADS Document Unique ID: 00 Drafter: n/a

Enclosure: n/a Executive Order: N/A Errors: n/a Film Number: n/a From: NATO

Handling Restrictions: n/a

Image Path:

Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730458/abqcdygt.tel Line Count: 104 Locator: TEXT ON-LINE

Office: n/a

Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Original Handling Restrictions: n/a Original Previous Classification: n/a Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a

Page Count: 2

Previous Channel Indicators:

Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL

Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 60887 (NOTAL); B) USNATO 1415
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja

Review Comment: n/a Review Content Flags: Review Date: 03 AUG 2001

Review Event:

Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by boyleja>

Review Markings:

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier: Review Referrals: n/a Review Release Date: n/a Review Release Event: n/a **Review Transfer Date:** Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a

Secure: OPEN Status: NATIVE

Subject: CSCE: CONFIDENCE- BUILDING MEASURES TAGS: PFOR, PARM

To: STATE

SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS

HELSINKI USICINCEUR **USNMR SHAPE**

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005